



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,390	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030238US1	7557
46797	7590	01/08/2008	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			HARPER, LEON JONATHAN	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2166		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		01/08/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/600,390	CHATTERJEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leon J. Harper	2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9,11-18 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9,11-18,25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/20/2003
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 10/15/2007 has been entered. Claim 25 has been amended. No claims has been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 9,11-18 and 25 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 9,11-18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 20040205545 (hereinafter Bar), in view of US5253362 (Nolan).

As for claim 9 Bar discloses:: one or more applications for manipulating data (See paragraph 0021); an annotation store for storing annotations created for data

manipulated by the one or more applications (See paragraph 0025 lines 9-10) an annotation browser configured to access the annotation store and provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing annotations for data manipulated by the one or more (See paragraph 0025). Bar however does not disclose an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects; and wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked. Nolan however does disclose an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects and wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked (See column 2 lines 50-60). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Nolan into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of browsing and storing annotations, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan, would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Nolan's teaching would enable users of the bar system to fan out annotations, and store annotations in scratch pad form.

As for claim 11 the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display data and indications

of what displayed data has one or more corresponding annotations (See column 5 lines 35-42).

As for claim 12 the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further Bar discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display one or more annotation icons proximate to an annotated data object (See paragraph 0027).

As for claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein: at least one common annotation describes more than one data object (See figure 6 and column 5 lines 51-55), and the annotation browser is configured to display a common annotation icon proximate to data objects described by the common annotation (See column 5 lines 60-65 notes the nurses notes hold annotations).

As for claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display different annotation icons proximate to data objects described by different annotations (See figure 5 and note that you are going to get a different view depending on what the annotation is).

As for claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon

to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations (See column 5 line 60-column 6 line 4 and noting that icon is in a cell and will display differently depending on the annotation) .

As for claim 16, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first portion of annotation data from an annotation, in response to a user positioning a cursor over an associated annotation icon (See Figure 5 “showing details”).

As for claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further Nolan disclose: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, display a second portion of annotation data from the annotation (See figure 6 “expanded annotations”).

As for claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, retrieve the second portion of annotation data from the annotation store (See figure 6 and note that annotations are contained within the local data storage).

Claim 25 is a system claim substantially comprising the same limitations as claim 1 and is thus rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/15/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

Nolan teaches that a document contained in a database is being accessed by the documents appropriate application. For example, a spreadsheet is being viewed in a program similar to Microsoft Excel. One or more of the cells in the spreadsheet may have an annotation and an associated link. When the link is selected the annotation is displayed. The example of an annotation that is given by Nolan is some sort of form that may have various attributes obtained from one or more object instances of one or more object classes. Nolan goes on to liken the link in the spreadsheet to "hypertext," in which a word or symbol in one document is linked to another document. However, the claims recite an "annotation browser is configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects; and wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked." Examples of embodiments covered by the recited language of claims 9 and 25 can be found in specification, paragraphs [0118] through [0124]: In contrast to claims 9 and 25, Nolan does not teach an annotation browser, annotations linking back to the data objects, or the invoking of an application to display the original data object. Nolan merely teaches links to annotations while viewing data described by those annotations. However, Nolan is completely silent as to the processing data in the opposite direction

as recited in the claims, namely accessing annotated data via a link displayed with an annotation.

Examiner responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). In this case the argued limitations of claims 9 and 25 only require that the annotation browser display 1. annotations and 2. links to associated annotated data objects, And while applicant points to specific embodiments in the specification the term data object is a term broader than any of the specific embodiments. Nolan discloses annotation links to forms or reports associated with a data cell (See Nolan column 2 lines 50-52).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJH
Leon J. Harper
January 2, 2008



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER